

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION**

JANET MASON,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	No. 3:13-CV-2875-PBH
	)	
MARCUS D. KING,	)	
Defendant.	)	Referred to U.S. Magistrate Judge

**FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATION**

Pursuant to *Special Order No. 3-251*, this case has been automatically referred for pretrial management. Based on the relevant filings and applicable law, the case should be **DISMISSED** as frivolous.

**I. BACKGROUND**

On July 23, 2013, Janet Mason (Plaintiff) filed this action against Pastor Marcus D. King. She claims that he drugged her with heroin, beat and raped her in her home in August of 2012. She also claims that King viewed her through illegal cameras for a year and preached a sermon at church detailing the rape, that four other pastors have preached sermons detailing her gang rape, and that King has taken photographs of her body and recordings of her voice that he has given to many other church pastors. Plaintiff also asserts that she has reported everything that happened to her to the local police department and the FBI, and that someone has interfered with her computer, which prevented her from filing her complaint earlier. (Compl. at 1).

**II. PRELIMINARY SCREENING**

Because Plaintiff has been granted permission to proceed *in forma pauperis*, his complaint is subject to preliminary screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). That section provides for *sua sponte* dismissal if the Court finds the complaint “frivolous or malicious” or if it “fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.” A claim is frivolous if it “lacks an arguable basis either

in law or in fact.” *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989). A claim lacks an arguable basis in law when it is “based on an indisputably meritless legal theory.” *Id.* at 327. A claim lacks an arguable basis in fact when it describes “fantastic or delusional scenarios.” *Id.* at 327-28. Courts

may dismiss a claim as factually frivolous only if the facts alleged are clearly baseless, a category encompassing allegations that are fanciful, fantastic, and delusional. As those words suggest, a finding of factual frivolousness is appropriate when the facts alleged rise to the level of the irrational or the wholly incredible, whether or not there are judicially noticeable facts available to contradict them.

*Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 32-33 (1992) (citations and internal quotation marks omitted).

A complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted when it fails to plead “enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007).

Plaintiff claims that her church pastor has illegally photographed her and raped her, that he has informed numerous other people in her church and the community about these acts, and that she has reported these acts to local authorities. Under § 1915(e), a court is not bound to accept without question the truth of a *pro se* plaintiff’s allegations. *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. at 32-33. The absence of material facts, combined with the irrational nature of a claim, can support a finding of factual frivolousness. *See Wesson v. Oglesby*, 910 F.2d 278, 281 (5th Cir. 1990). Plaintiff’s claims lack an arguable basis in fact because they are based on a fantastical or delusional scenario. *See Neitzke*, 490 U.S. at 327-28; *Kolocotronis v. Club of Rome*, 109 F.3d 767 (5th Cir. 1997) (affirming the dismissal of a complaint describing a government plot to spread the AIDS virus throughout the world). This action should be dismissed as frivolous.

### III. RECOMMENDATION

This action should be **DISMISSED** with prejudice pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2).

**SIGNED this 24th day of July, 2013.**

  
IRMA CARRILLO RAMIREZ  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

### **INSTRUCTIONS FOR SERVICE AND NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL/OBJECT**

A copy of these findings, conclusions and recommendation shall be served on all parties in the manner provided by law. Any party who objects to any part of these findings, conclusions and recommendation must file specific written objections within 14 days after being served with a copy. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). In order to be specific, an objection must identify the specific finding or recommendation to which objection is made, state the basis for the objection, and specify the place in the magistrate judge's findings, conclusions and recommendation where the disputed determination is found. An objection that merely incorporates by reference or refers to the briefing before the magistrate judge is not specific. Failure to file specific written objections will bar the aggrieved party from appealing the factual findings and legal conclusions of the magistrate judge that are accepted or adopted by the district court, except upon grounds of plain error. *See Douglass v. United Servs. Automobile Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1417 (5th Cir. 1996).

  
IRMA CARRILLO RAMIREZ  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE